

Indianapolis, IN • November 9-12, 2016 SESSION EVALUATION RESULTS

No Panhandling, No Sleeping in Public: One Community's Response to Efforts Made to Eradicate Homelessness Without Infringing on the Constitutional Rights of the Homeless.

SPEAKERS: Jeff Yungman, Steve Binder and Mary Vosburgh

Session/Speaker Evaluation

The session content was consistent with description in the agenda

	Choices	Count	Percent
1	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2	2	0	0%
3	3	0	0%
4	4	4	36%
5	Strongly Agree	7	64%
	Mean	4.64	

The session information will help me be more effective in my position.

	Choices	Count	Percent
1	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2	2	0	0%
3	3	0	0%
4	4	4	33%
5	Strongly Agree	8	67%
	Mean	4.67	

I can use the information I learned right away.

	Choices	Count	Percent
1	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2	2	0	0%
3	3	1	8%
4	4	2	17%
5	Strongly Agree	9	75%
	Mean	4.67	

Overall, the speakers for this session were knowledgeable.

	, i		
	Choices	Count	Percent
1	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2	2	0	0%
3	3	0	0%
4	4	3	25%
5	Strongly Agree	9	75%
	Mean	4.75	



Indianapolis, IN • November 9-12, 2016 SESSION EVALUATION RESULTS

Overall, the speakers for this session were engaging.

Choices	Count	Percent
1 Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2 2	0	0%
3 3	0	0%
4 4	3	25%
5 Strongly Agree	9	75%
Mean	4.75	

The session met or exceeded my expectation.

Choices	Count	Percent
1 Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2 2	0	0%
3 3	1	8%
4 4	3	25%
5 Strongly Agree	8	67%
Mean	4.58	

The topics covered were relevant, interesting and timely.

	Choices	Count	Percent
1	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2	2	0	0%
3	3	0	0%
4	4	4	33%
5	Strongly Agree	8	67%
	Mean	4.67	

The session was interactive with significant audience participation.

	Choices	Count	Percent
1	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2	2	0	0%
3	3	2	17%
4	4	3	25%
5	Strongly Agree	7	58%
	Mean	4.42	

The handouts and materials were useful.

	Choices	Count	Percent
1	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2	2	0	0%
3	3	0	0%
4	4	2	20%
5	Strongly Agree	8	80%
	Mean	4.80	



Indianapolis, IN • November 9-12, 2016 SESSION EVALUATION RESULTS

Audio-visual aids were used effectively.

	Choices	Count	Percent
1	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2	2	0	0%
3	3	1	9%
4	4	3	27%
5	Strongly Agree	7	64%
	Mean	4.55	

Approximately how many participants attended this session?

Choices	Count	Percent
1 0 to 10	0	0%
2 11 to 25	4	36%
3 26 to 40	6	55%
4 41 to 60	1	9%
5 61 to 75	0	0%
6 76 or more	0	0%
Mean	2.73	

Would you recommend this session for next year's conference agenda?

	Choices	Count	Percent
1	Yes	11	100%
2	No	0	0%
	Mean	1.00	

Would you recommend this particular faculty for next year's conference?

	Choices	Count	Percent
1	Yes	11	100%
2	No	0	0%
Mean		1.00	

Why or why not?

- They were great!
- No recommend adding faculty to put broader perspective very much interest in session. Should be expanded.
- Good presenters, know their stuff.
- Necessary.
- Knowledge & passion.
- Worked very well together.



Indianapolis, IN • November 9-12, 2016 SESSION EVALUATION RESULTS

What in particular about this session would you like us to know about and why?

- Wonderful topic.
- It was interesting to see an example of one community's story.
- Excellent.
- Innovative and informative.
- Excellent, useful presentation.
- The speakers were especially passionate and knowledgeable in their presentation.
- Made me think, "Why aren't we doing this in Indiana?" What can I do to start this?

What are your overall impressions about the faculty at this particular session?

- Great, knowledgeable, prepared.
- Very informative & unique legal model of lawyers stationed in homeless shelter.
- Very knowledgeable.
- Resourcefully knowledgeable.
- Very knowledgeable, obviously very passionate about their work.
- In the trenches.
- Very good.
- Very well prepared, knowledgeable, concerned committed. Many ideas & stories, examples.